

**PC/BOCC WORKSESSION
PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES TO COMP PLAN
THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 2003**

Public Services Center
1300 Franklin Street
BOCC Hearing Room, 6th Floor
Vancouver, Washington
6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

PRIDEMORE: Well, good evening, everybody. Why don't we go ahead and get started. Would you like to start introductions.

ROLL CALL & INTRODUCTIONS

SMITH: Carey Smith, Planning Commission.

STANTON: Judie Stanton.

DELEISSEGUES: Dick Deleissegues.

BARCA: Ron Barca.

PRIDEMORE: Craig Pridemore.

LEIN: Vaughn Lein.

LEE: Pat Lee.

MORRIS: Betty Sue Morris.

MOSS: Lonnie Moss.

(Introductions made.)

PRIDEMORE: Bill Stuart. No one wanted to give any affiliation I see.

MORRIS: It's nice to meet you all for the first time.

PRIDEMORE: Well, we have agenda changes. What's the agenda changes, Pat?

LEE: You won't like what I suggested as an agenda change.

PRIDEMORE: Anything? Anybody else want to add to the agenda or concerns? Let's go on to -- the idea here is that we've got a couple follow-ups to -- actually one follow-up to last week's work session and then I thought it would be a good idea to at least take a look at the site-specific requests that we've got in. The Board, as all of you know, chose to suspend the regular annual review process a few years ago and we said that folks could submit requests or thoughts about how they would like to have their land treated during the comprehensive plan review and then we would try to address some of those issues as this plan went forward. We received somewhere in the neighborhood of 300 site-specific requests and we really don't want to go through each one of those requests as much as take a look at the map to throw this open to everything, effective comprehensive plan, and

really give you guys a chance to make your pitch about issues you think are really important that maybe we haven't been taking into account, specific thoughts on the alternatives and direction you feel we should go essentially just an open discussion and really an opportunity for you to make your views known about where we should go from here. So with that said let's go on to questions raised from last week.

LEE: Yeah, you asked us about 11 questions last week and the staff report provides sort of the responses to the questions based on the information that we were able to double-check and verify. And probably since this was just a table here, the one we got here, I should briefly walk through it.

The first one is why the UGB is only four percent and the reason that we think that occurred is because of the annexation after adoption of the comprehensive plan and we weren't comparing apples to apples when we were doing the absorption rate because we were doing it on a different land base. Further interesting note, Vancouver has indicated that they've seen a lot of industrial jobs created on what would be redevelopment land as well. So that's that one.

Can we identify 75 plus acre parcels by FPIA. Now it might be hard to get there, but we do have a Table 1 at the end of the staff report or Exhibit 1 that looks like this, a very small print so we could get it on one page, but it actually goes through each of the FPIAs and identifies a variety of parcel sizes available in commercial, industrial, other and redevelopable land. "Other" is primarily if you were to convert residential to job creation uses, that is what that category covers.

MORRIS: I found it once but I lost it. I can find it again.

LEE: You want me to wait?

MORRIS: No, go ahead.

LEE: Okay. And here you can see what parcel range is in terms of very large parcel areas surrounding. Battle Ground, Ridgefield Junction, Burnt Bridge Creek had the greatest number of large parcels, each with about four, and in the I believe it's the 50 plus range. And some of these, including all four of Ridgefield's, are found in the "redevelopable" category, which is interesting because of the way the vacant buildable lands model assesses what is vacant these actually have some farms on it that are high enough assessed value that they show up as fully developed even though there is large parcels that are largely in agricultural activity in that area.

PRIDEMORE: And you don't have to answer this if it's impossible, but can you give an example like 164th greater than 75 acres?

LEE: I couldn't pick out a specific. We actually retried to draw a map to show where they

were and it crashed and burned on the product so we weren't able to deliver that to you.

RUPLEY: That's right next to my condo.

LEE: There is a way to apply the CREDC criteria to the evaluation of FPIAs and Attachment 2 is a fairly detailed response to this that actually goes through each of the factors that we could measure that were identified in the CREDC letter and those factors included distance to the Interstate highway system, access to major highways and arterials, cost and availability of shovel-ready sites, proximity to similar types of industries and facilities, parcel size, time to occupancy, environmental constraints to development. And then they have a list of sort of strategic factors and specific locations that they saw as being strategic because of some of the nucleus of industry there or of possible connections, for example, with the WSU area.

So we did take a stab, you know, cut at our assessment and we have tables for each of those factors in Exhibit 2. And we also tried to digest it into sort of an overall ranking based on those factors that we could measure. And, again, this is staff's interpretation and that is why everything is marked "draft" since it has not had any discussion yet, but those that overall seemed to do well was 164th Avenue, Fisher Swale, Port of Vancouver, Downtown Vancouver and Ridgefield Junction, again applying those factors that were given to measure.

The next question was there a subset of industrial nodes identified in the 1994 plan that were given special priority/attention for implementation. If so, what node has been suggested. Actually I think the industrial nodes came upon us through the remand process and we identified Burnt Bridge Creek, Port of Vancouver, Columbia Tech Center, Ridgefield Junction, Camas Industrial Area, I-205/Padden Expressway, Port of Camas-Washougal and the WSU area as industrial nodes when we were responding to the remand. Beyond that, we did, "we" meaning actually as a result of entities were involved in putting together a few reports on some of these.

For example, Burnt Bridge Creek, Port of Vancouver, Ridgefield Junction and Columbia Tech Center, I believe it was Camas had -- Camas, Vancouver, the County and the Port all had roles of putting it together and basically what it did was just sort of review in more detail the land use constraints and characteristics of the particular sites so it is much like what we see now as in the developers' packet. It sort of took these areas and put together developers' packets for them, maybe little things here we cover, but they were not used to focus subsequent public investments necessary, although they were used as marketing pieces to try and let people know about some of the characteristics of these industrial nodes. So those four, there was a separate report, but it did not have any sort of strategic investments or policy beyond using it as sort of an informational market piece about those industrial nodes.

Table A-6 in the FPIA, infrastructure cost report, please be advised that we had some

trouble with the headings. And there was also just it wasn't intuitive for folks to understand the distinctions between the basic columns two, three and four so we had three and four which have changed the headers of those columns that are hopefully make it clear. That column one only addresses costs associated with currently vacant industrially and commercially designated lands. Before I think it was just currently vacant land was a little bit confusing so we tried to be a little bit more precise in the header. And we did check the figure on the Discovery Corridor, the 330,346, just because it was mostly rural zoning. At this point there is not a lot of commercial/industrial and that is why that cost in that column is so high. As you bring on land and rezone it to other purposes, obviously the cost per job costs comes down in the Discovery Corridor. So what's skewing it is just because there's very little land designated for those purposes in that area right now.

STANTON: So that is not a typo?

LEE: That is not a typo. But in reading that number it's easy to reach to the wrong conclusion as to what it's saying.

PRIDEMORE: And it's that second column, then, that's for the rezoning?

LEE: It's that second column, then, for that. The next question was about the nickel transportation package and the revenue perspective did not assume any bump that, that reflected that; rather what we heard from WSDOT staff was that was probably going to be the only capital funding that we could identify that we'd be receiving in the next 20 years. So it didn't result in the bump, but it did result in a spreading over that nucleus of projects over a 20-year period for an annual average cost of investment that is about 50 percent less than what has historically been the case. But that is just us taking what we heard from WSDOT staff policy makers, but that was what we heard from WSDOT, but that's the context we made.

PRIDEMORE: This essentially just looking at it the nickel package is a ten year kind of program?

LEE: You've got some long-term projects there.

PRIDEMORE: 20 years, so it's not unreasonably to assume it's a nickel package.

LEE: We didn't know what to identify there so we tried to present it conservative, hopefully what would be a conservative estimate of what might actually be there. One of the more fine areas that we went into more detail in response was in the infrastructure factor, and so what we did is we actually went and took another look at those areas that we sampled for in Vancouver and came out with the same conclusion that the general is about a 27 percent including parks, schools, the off-site infrastructure. We also did look at the residential subdivisions approved between '95 and '99, and in unincorporated portions, and found there was a percentage of infrastructure in site plans reviewed and subdivisions

reviewed was 27.5 percent.

MORRIS: Was that just a subdivision?

LEE: Well, basically what you did is you kind of took an area that was more or less built out and you assessed and verified it by checking some of what the infrastructure set-asides were, the actual maps. And then we've also done a couple of things in working with Public Works last year, we sort of did a rough proportionality indicating 17.8 percent of land that is dedicated to roads that would be the infrastructure category and that's probably the largest category in terms of assumption. And also they included in on Page 5 of the supplemental staff report is kind of a table that Vancouver provided that sort of goes through in what the breakdown of various uses were and sort of the bottom line total infrastructure set-aside without critical and without airport, 29.3 percent infrastructure set-aside. And then those, there was a little more of a challenge so we had to make some best guesstimates.

We did take a look at Battle Ground which does have a lot of vacant land within the area. We looked -- which can tend to skew the figures. It would appear based on the publicly owned properties that particularly most school sites and parks have been set aside in the area, but there are a lot of vacant land so you can expect more land to be used for roads, utilities, et cetera, as the area is built out. But sort of the range of infrastructure to total acres at the moment is 23.2 percent and infrastructure to the percent that is built now, just that percent that is built if you, you know, if you compare infrastructure to total acres and you use the same infrastructure to built acres, which is less, you get a higher percentage than 37. It's probably going to be around 30 percent infrastructure set aside based on what we can see for current publicly owned land or (inaudible) patterns and the type of infrastructure that we're seeing in that area of the community. So that is kind of the overall review that we did in response to the infrastructure question.

The next area is revisit or develop samples used to assess employment densities and we did actually go out and update some information that we had in the buildable lands report and went from sort of a midyear 2000 data to end of year 2000 data, so there wasn't a huge time difference but that was the data that was available, and we found that based on that information industrial densities were about ten jobs per gross per acre, and gross densities were about 22 jobs per acre, and then the updated actually showed a decline to 8.1 employees per acre for industrial, although commercial densities increased a little bit to 22.9 employees per acre. We think what is happening is that we're beginning to head in the economic downturn at that point so we're having increasing amount of vacant industrial, vacant office space, and we threw in some figures here just to indicate what the magnitude of the problem is so that maybe skewing that 8.1 percent down if our best, you know, very quick explanation is accurate. And we also took a look at some work that Port of Vancouver did and they said ten employees per gross acres for theirs and for commercial area, and near the Mill Plain and 205 area they came up with about 23.76 employees per acre. So it seems that like the, while the industrial employees per acre densities seem maybe about right, but using commercial seems definitely low based on

this information.

MOSS: Pat, if I could, this may be a good time for me to interject something that at the last hearing last week there was some interest in finding out what the density of development at East Ridge Business Park was and I contacted T.J. Fontenette who provided me with his best guess estimate. It's a 90-acre site, they believe that at full stabilization that they'll have about 2,000 employees and that equates to 22 employees per acre, which is quite a bit higher than I had expected it would be.

PRIDEMORE: Would we consider that light industrial? Help me.

MOSS: Well, the zoning is light industrial, but the development was done under developers' agreements and there's, you know, there's some outright commercial at East Ridge that, along the perimeter there but most of it is office space and light manufacturing or light industrial. And there's a real mix of uses in there. As a matter of fact there's enough of that light industrial usage in there that I was kind of frankly surprised to see 22 jobs per acre there and I'm sure that that's a pretty good estimate.

LEIN: But that's at final build out; right?

MOSS: That's at final built out.

LEIN: And currently they're not there.

MOSS: They're about two-thirds complete at this time.

PRIDEMORE: They're all built but --

MOSS: No, it's not all built, there's still vacant land there.

LEE: Which is kind of in the range of some of these other issues.

RUPLEY: It's similar to what you had.

LEE: I think depending on what it is. It sounds like it's probably comparable.

PRIDEMORE: Distinguishing that between the industrial use and the commercial type use and the office type use because I don't think this leads us to a commercial that light industrial is 22 acres or 22 employee per acre.

MOSS: No, not at all. This is definitely a mixed use development so it can't be characterized as any one of those.

STANTON: But it's very similar to what I read in our business park zoning the other day

when we were reviewing it. I mean there's everything from a dentist in there to commercial restaurant, those kinds of --

PRIDEMORE: Stenographer.

STANTON: I don't know of a stenographer in there, that's a leftover from a work session, but it is -- I mean it's in our definition of a "business park," East Ridge very much fits it, but it might be different. Well, it would be different. It seems if you were talking about office buildings that were four, five stories high, then you'd get a different density.

MORRIS: There is a brand-new small development of just exactly that on Highway 99 just -- it's not Lonnie's.

STANTON: It's Lonnie's?

MORRIS: It's not Lonnie's. It must be about 126th or 137th. Kirkwood Three, really, really attractive brick buildings that are intended to be office buildings. And I don't know what they anticipate their density will be really, pretty --

PRIDEMORE: It seems pretty complicated to settle on a solid number.

STANTON: I know on office/campus it might be, but there are other places like out by Van Mall or Mill Plain One or something that we might be able to get some numbers from.

MORRIS: We're not going to get real accurate anyway.

STANTON: I'm surprised this is this high.

PRIDEMORE: Okay. Moving on, Mr. Lee.

LEE: Okay. The next page, reconcile the build-out numbers in the DEIS with those in the staff report. The numbers in the staff report last week were wrong so I fess up to making an egregious error. We have gone back and double-checked things and triple-checked things and after some smoothing we're pretty sure these are the right numbers between control total and effective population. The total population is the factor on the top half of the table and it's the growth and employment on the lower. So it's not total employment, lower it's just total unemployment and these are kind of the factors that drove the EIS analysis. And if you take what you see under effective population build out and you go on to Number 10, that is what it equates to in terms of annual total rate on the last row.

PRIDEMORE: The effective build out, what did you use for employment densities to reach these numbers or did you just do market factor or --

LEE: Mike, do you want to take that one.

MABREY: The employment densities are just as they were stated in the matrix. The five columns and each alternative had somewhat different ones. So that for Alternative 1, 2, 4 and 5 they were the 9 and 12, for 3 it was the higher numbers that came out of the buildable lands report.

PRIDEMORE: If that's the case, what's the difference between the control number versus the effective? I mean what factors are calculated differently between these two? There's got to be something rather than --

MABREY: The effective is the result of once we've sized the boundaries and run the buildable lands model and the TAZ allocations, that's how many jobs we get there. So that's full build out of --

PRIDEMORE: But you're not changing the employment density from what --

MABREY: No.

PRIDEMORE: -- from what the control numbers, so you're changing infrastructure deduction, the market factor, there's something between the two columns that's different.

LEE: It varies by the assumptions for alternatives, right.

PRIDEMORE: That's what I'm asking, which assumptions were changed?

MABREY: The control numbers were kind of the targets that were set initially for each alternative.

LEE: So, yes, some of it. Well, again it varies by alternative, but if you look at the factors that changed back -- as a matter of fact in Alternative 1, for example, I think it was still kept the 60/40 housing split because that was employed.

PRIDEMORE: I'm just looking at the employment one. I understand the population.

LEE: Okay, the employment. There was a connection between growth rate and job creation to some extent so where you have -- but that would be constant through 2 through 5 so that would not reflect. I think we might have adjusted, again it varies by alternative, but at some point determines on one of those factors.

PRIDEMORE: So you did modify that?

MABREY: In some ways. It's partly because of a result of the market factor. I mean the

market factor is built into the controlled total part whereas if we fully populated every piece of ground.

PRIDEMORE: So the market factor would be included in here?

MABREY: Right.

PRIDEMORE: And job density is?

MABREY: Yeah.

PRIDEMORE: And then my original question was what job densities did you use for that column? For the "effective" I mean.

LEE: For Alternative C we would have --

PRIDEMORE: C?

LEE: I'm going back two years where we had A, B and C and now it's 1 through 5. For Alternative 3, Alternative 3, the no boundary movement, we used the observed employment densities.

PRIDEMORE: And the observed were the ones --

LEE: 22.

PRIDEMORE: -- between 10 and 22?

LEE: Yes, between 10 and 22.

BARCA: But only Alternative 3.

PRIDEMORE: Alternative 3 is the only one that doesn't have a market factor?

LEE: Yes. Yes.

BARCA: So you've got higher density and no market factor.

MORRIS: You took the market factor out in all of them, didn't you, under all?

LEE: No. What the approach we took is we sized the boundaries and those alternatives that had a market factor we sized it and fully populated inside the UGA.

MORRIS: So you built up -- got it, okay.

BARCA: Why wasn't the observed numbers used for the effective employment column? I'm confused.

LEE: Well, we had one alternate range of alternatives. In 2001 the Board gave us the direction to use kind of the 9/12 factors --

BARCA: Right, I remember.

LEE: -- and as we used in most, but we did test what the implications would be to address the full range of alternatives at least in one of those Alternative C just to, you know, fully --

PRIDEMORE: 3.

LEE: -- cover a broader spectrum of possibilities.

BARCA: But it seems like now we're picking and choosing between observed numbers and assumed numbers whether we're at the same points, kind of disproving some of the assumptions. So if we're going to be with the observed numbers it seems like bouncing those against each one of the alternatives would then give a truer implication of what the alternative was going to bring us. At least that's what I'm seeing. If we take just one and slice that one out and put observed numbers in there, then it has data that's not reflective in any of the others. So when we start looking at boundary issues it has a completely different set of criteria that created the boundary. Yeah? No? Yeah?

LEE: Yeah. I mean there are --

BARCA: Did we ask you to do that? Or what I'm trying to figure out what caused just Alternative 3 to get that observed number thrown into it?

PRIDEMORE: Now you lost me. I forget what you were asking.

BARCA: Well, Mike said that Alternative 3 had the observed numbers put into the employment rather than --

PRIDEMORE: As I understand the effective employment numbers, that's what they all would contain. Is that not the case?

LEE: When we fully populated the transportation analysis results with the jobs were we assuming the observed or were we assuming the assumptions, the original assumptions?

MABREY: We kept the assumptions constant with the numbers that were in the matrix for the jobs.

LEE: So you capitulated based on the assumptions in each of the alternatives --

MABREY: Uh-huh.

LEE: -- right?

MABREY: Right.

BARCA: Except Alternative 3, which has the observed?

LEE: No. I mean the assumptions were pretty explicit. These were all of the assumptions that were put into Alternative 3 in terms of housing splits, observed densities, et cetera. So I mean it was -- frankly it has been a challenge in doing sort of an apples to apples comparison across the board for alternatives because we, you know, each of them are driven by a little bit different set of assumptions, in addition to a little different set of job creation goals, but we felt that that was a better approach to kind of examining a range of alternatives and that's --

MABREY: Another reason why there's such a significant difference between the control total and the effective employment is that the effective employment in order to be consistent with the way the transportation model looks at everything was factored up by the DEA adjustment so it's 34 percent higher so that's why you see such a large spread in there. And I think we went over the DEA adjustment. There's two different ways of measuring employment. Theirs covering 1.34 is a factor that they used to estimate actual employment, that includes home based and sales forces that are not covered, that sort of thing. So that's why you have almost a hundred percent difference between the two.

LEE: Those are all the questions that we recorded and responded to. I don't know if you want to talk about those or the 21 very brief overview site-specific requests and then go on.

PRIDEMORE: Were there any other questions on this from anybody?

LEE: You know, as Craig mentioned, we have been accumulating site-specific requests for a while and why don't you turn it the other way. This is, you know, kind of we have a table that cross-references all these with numbers, et cetera, so we can pick out the actual files and the actual requests. But that's just a, you know, that's probably current through I guess the end of May. I would say we had one in the DEIS, this is updated from the EIS. And we still get more of these in. I just wanted to show you that so you can see kind of a general. That block long northern, northern fringe of the Vancouver UGA, for example, we have a cluster in the Ridgefield area and some in Lacamas Lake area, but I think probably just more important as an overview, if you want to turn it over now, just to give you an idea of the types of uses that people are stepping up to go to shall we say about 906 acres are being proposed to become an industrial classification of some sort, about 679 acres of commercial, about 1,596 acres of residential, about 245 acres of public facilities, 240 acres

are requesting to become an urban reserve, and going from a resource designation to a rural designation about 1,387 acres. So that is kind of the breakdown of where they're going to.

Now in terms of the process that we would suggest for reviewing this, I think clearly the direction on the preferred alternative will probably lead us to conclusions about some of these along the fringe that may or may not come into the urban growth boundary. The one issue that I could see come up might be if, for example, someone is suggesting coming in as a residential designation where we feel that would be a strategic location for a commercial or something (inaudible) landowner has not done, that's clearly something that is out there to discuss and see which direction to go. Or for others outside and inside the urban growth boundary, we would rather, and perhaps, you know, we review something in a work session with you or not, but if there is those that pique your interests, and as maybe good changes to move towards, we would suggest that you let us know. And then the reason we want to do that is to do some additional noticing of the areas immediately around those and those that are fall outside of sort of the urban fringe issue and how the outside of kind of those that you feel is appropriate to address at this time they would just you would, I guess, recommend that that they not be pursued at this point in time. So that is the process that we would suggest for dealing with these because there's a huge number.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah, I think that makes sense. The purpose in this is, you know, these are all questions that you didn't see under the annual reviews over the passing years so we wanted to give you some introduction on this because you haven't seen it before. And if you wanted to be in our discussions without you seeing it, accept your thoughts or comments as we move forward. Okay.

LEE: Okay. That --

PRIDEMORE: Any questions on those?

LEE: -- that concludes my presentation.

MOSS: Just a comment. You know, I had some concerns about the integrity of the process here and that we haven't submitted requests for some time and it sounds as though we may be dismissing a lot of these out of hand without much consideration. And if, you know, if that really is the intent here, I would certainly recommend that we not suspend the annual review process in the future.

PRIDEMORE: I think the way it was told to people was that as decisions, whatever decisions that were made during this comprehensive plan process, as they were made that would have a bearing on a particular area that they wanted that we would take that into consideration as we move forward with this. I mean one thing on those areas outside of the urban growth boundary things would be if the data, this was early on that this was, this

policy direction was taken, if the policies suggested that we need to create more lots in the rural area, the idea was let's find out if there are people out there who wanted to create additional lots for example that that would then trigger and we would give all due consideration to people who had that interest, but I don't think the promise was made that a policy decision was going to be made that would grant -- all of these people did have the option of paying the annual review fee and continuing through the annual review process, but since that fee is \$5,000 --

MOSS: Actually they didn't --

LEE: They didn't for a couple of years. Last year we did reopen the process and we tried to be very up front with people as staff persons and we suggested to them -- I'm not trying to (inaudible) that if we felt this was, you know, one of those very difficult policy challenges that wasn't consistent with our existing comp plan policies that we would likely recommend denial. That means you can't -- that staff would recommend to the policy makers that this may be denied because we didn't want them to spend all the money and feel that we had given them misinformation by accepting their application and not saying anything. So I think we were very up front with folks, at least where the staff was likely to fall based on the issue of policies.

With that said, we still said you do have the option to pursue it and get your day in court through the annual review process. And we also presented this option as because, you know, we started collecting these three years ago. So the evolution from three years ago to now we couldn't tell them then where things are heading and I still can't tell them exactly where things are heading.

PRIDEMORE: Your point is right though, Lonnie, we recognize that our thought was we were going to suspend for one year, open up the annual review process, well, that crept into the two years because of all the changes we made up early in that process. The third year, if you want to you can apply and I think we've tried to make that as fair as we could thinking in hindsight.

MOSS: I'm particularly concerned about some of those folks who were looking for changes in the rural area which obviously it was not the focus of this whole comp plan update, and yet they were suspended for a couple of years because they were -- certainly there was no promise given to any of them they were going to be favorably -- that the outcome was going to be favorable, but they were in a position where they had no process to even make that request and the reason was that that we were going to be doing this comprehensive plan update. I guess my suggestion would be that at least in the future and, you know, that's some time until we do the next review, we should not repeat that unless there's a good reason.

PRIDEMORE: I think we'd all agree with that. Like I said at the time, we didn't realize we were suspending over three years, five years scoping, and then shift another ten and that's

where it all fell out.

LEIN: How do you see this not going forward and becoming a site-specific issue though?

PRIDEMORE: I'm sorry?

LEIN: As we look at alternatives, how do you see this not going forward? You look around the UGB, a huge number of these parcels are adjacent to it. Those people have it, starts the discussion, goes to do it, you bring it in or not, it's going to become a site-specific criteria for anybody who testifies.

PRIDEMORE: I'm not sure what you mean. In terms of notification?

LEIN: Notification as well as the testimony the Board's going to have with whatever alternative goes forward. And us too. My concern is it's still going to become a lot of site-specific issues.

PRIDEMORE: Well, sure, but that would be true regardless of whether we had this or not, wouldn't it? I mean our thing is rather than simply expanding the boundary at this point, we'd have some good data of what the property owners in that area would like to have happen and that seems like something worth having so that we can satisfy as many of those folks as possible within the context of the plan.

MORRIS: Yeah, they don't have to do a site-specific request, they can just come through or come in.

PRIDEMORE: Rezone them.

MORRIS: And it just may not be what they ask for, but they could just come in.

PRIDEMORE: It's essentially a lot less expensive, although a much more timely process for these folks rather than -- if possible rather than zoning somebody for something that they don't want. We'll make every effort to honor their desires. So does that --

LEIN: No, I still get concerned that, you know, in the past hearings a lot of it has become very site-specific oriented rather than more global, and looks now having this understanding of what they want will probably simplify the process rather than have 14 or 114 people come before us.

PRIDEMORE: I think reasonably less.

LOWRY: There is some judicial rulings that are relevant to this. The fact that you end up with site-specific testimony that if due to isolation looks like it's judicatory. If it's in the context of a comprehensive area wide review does not change the fact that it's a legislative

process even if a hearing is held to take site-specific testimony. My concern, and I recommended that if we got direction from the Board to take a look at some of these requests that would not be related to the area wide aim of this plan update, if the Board wanted those addressed, then those would be viewed by the Court as something different. And it has some significant procedural implications to it, including notice, we have to do a different kind of notice for those than we do for the general update. But, again, the courts have specifically said that the fact that you end up having property-specific testimony in the context of a general legislative planning effort doesn't change the nature of the proceedings from legislative.

PRIDEMORE: So that was the nature of your question I guess. Did you understand that?

LEIN: Right. Right.

PRIDEMORE: Any other thoughts on that? With that said we are fairly well open for a free for all. Dick considered going around to each Commissioner and putting you on the spot and letting you speak about specifically what you wanted to, and then I thought, well, we won't put anybody on the spot and just kind of leave it open and if you want to talk about a specific policy area or if somebody just wants to make their views known.

SMITH: I do have one question on the FPIAs, Number 2. On the environmental part of it we keep -- I think there's 17 different FPIAs, but then we jump up to 19 by splitting Burnt Bridge Creek NW, SW and Battle Ground North and South of Salmon.

LEIN: What page are you on, Carey?

SMITH: That's Exhibit 2 in the newest handout. Sandra worked on it, June 18th. I don't have a page number here.

MOSS: They're at the top.

LEIN: They're up in the upper left-hand corner.

SMITH: Mine's stapled. Oh, oh, oh, sorry, 7.

LEIN: Okay. Thank you.

SMITH: Well hidden. For all the other factors you keep the 17 and then we split out those two on Table 5. I wondered, I guess, why we did that. And also how you reconcile that split when you bring them together again for the totals on the next table.

LEE: Evan, do you want to address that.

DUST: The data that that table was assembled from is from the FPIA cost study. They

broke the -- several of the large areas into two pieces because they saw dramatically different costs for addressing issues in the two pieces to get to the aggregate. To make them comparable with the other areas, we just took the average. So if something scored sort of middle of the range on that factor for one part of it and on the low end of the range, we put two together so you sort of got a medium low.

SMITH: Did you prorate that by the size of each --

DUST: No, not that specific in one week.

PRIDEMORE: Okay. We're all done? Lonnie, you've got that --

RUPLEY: That 45 minute look.

PRIDEMORE: -- look.

MOSS: I've been chastised by my fellow Commissioners for the length of some of my soliloquies though.

STANTON: You're fun to read, Lonnie.

MOSS: So I'm just going to sit here and kind of mind my manners.

PRIDEMORE: Well, maybe, specifically maybe a question to address would be if you were sitting where we're sitting which alternative would you be leaning toward and why?

SMITH: He wasn't going to put anybody on the spot though.

MOSS: Can we go over the rules again here.

PRIDEMORE: I guess I -- I mean the idea is this is kind of your time as opposed to having to stand up in a public hearing or anything like that and provide your input on the selection that we have to make. And, you know, if you don't have this opportunity, then you're, you don't have an opportunity except to stand up at the public hearing to express it so.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, why don't we do that, go around the table and see what we come up with.

PRIDEMORE: We don't want to have one later because once the preferred alternative is made, I mean this is a pretty significant decision and --

BARCA: We'll change it anyway though. Whatever preferred alternative you give us, we're going to change it anyway.

PRIDEMORE: And then we're going to change it.

BARCA: And then you'll change it back so that's how the process works.

PRIDEMORE: Do you have -- I mean --

DELEISSEGUES: Judie and me?

PRIDEMORE: You.

DELEISSEGUES: Oh.

PRIDEMORE: You seem to be willing to have --

DELEISSEGUES: If I were going to look at this, and I have been looking at it, and the way I did it was I took all the elements out of each of the alternatives, and there's many of them, and just erate them. I mean I don't think we should be limiting ourselves to an alternative. I think what you need to do is look at the elements of each of the alternatives and see which of those standing on their own merit, and of course you got to look at it when they're all put together too, so that's a second step, but the first step would be looking at all the elements and all of the alternatives and arraign those which one seemed to be just on the basis of the information presented supporting each of those elements in each alternative seem to be the best for the future of Clark County and see if you can put those together.

Like, for example, there's some really good things about the Discovery Corridor alternative. It may not be the best stand-alone alternative in and of itself, but there's certainly some elements in there that would fit any of the other alternatives and be really good I think for the future of the county. And somebody might say, well, that's no good, but that's at least a way to start. And then you look at the 1994 plan, there were some good things about the 1994 plan. And when you look at the results that accrued from the factors that we used to develop some of the information by the staff, they come out good, and then they come out with producing jobs, they come out with producing land that's possibly available for industry and industrial.

It's harder to do it that way. It would be a lot easier just to throw darts, I guess, at the box and not go outside of the box for each of these alternatives, but in my opinion there are some really good elements in all of them and they all need to be looked at, and then when those elements are identified as being something desirable for the county, see if it can be put together into a sixth alternative.

MORRIS: Are you talking about sort of the assumptions, which assumptions were in each one of the alternatives that are valuable assumptions?

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I think that want to create job creation I think is obviously one, revenue is another factor that has to be considered, which ones produce revenue. If I understood Evan right, it doesn't sound like our nickel buys us any more in Clark County, it just replaces money that would have come from the State. Maybe it's a little more stable but, so, you know, it looks like we're not going to be able to depend on outside sources of revenue as much as we're going to have to generate and create our own. So revenue production is certainly one of those things you would want to look at.

Quality of life. You know, the business of the infrastructure that Pat was talking about, parks and some of those kind of things, are included in that as well as right-of-way for roads and sewer lines, waterlines, maybe that percentage ought to be a little higher for infrastructure based on the fact that, you know, schools are going to need more area. And I think the parks, idea of putting parks and schools together so they can share some of those areas is a good one, recreational areas particularly. And I think that I always have said the rural area too I think needs to be looked at. The fact that the taxpayers out there put a lot of money into the pot, but it seems like a lot of the quality of life infrastructure gets deferred in the rural area because there aren't enough people out there to support it versus the urban area. You know, I could see maybe for every ten parks that's inside the city there ought to be one park developed. The land's there but we don't develop the land for the park. So some quality of life issues are important. I think it would be a factor you'd want to look at for a County comprehensive plan. Well, I could go on and on, but you know more about that than I do frankly.

LEIN: I think one of the important things is to agree on some of the things that Dick was talking about, but just on the total population that how fast that's going to occur because I don't think we've agreed in the past with the Board on just that issue. You know, we've seen a much higher growth than what you've anticipated and put into the plan and I think that that to me has been a major difference between our two groups, and if we continue to disagree on that I think we'll also impact, have an impact on the alternative that we're going to select because if you're going to tell us that it's going to be 1.3 or 1.5 or 1.9 that's to me considerably different than what the trend has been over the last ten years, as well as what we're seeing today even in the downturn economic conditions. So I'd like to maybe hear a little bit from the Board why they think of what they do on the population growth.

PRIDEMORE: I think there are three factors; that is, one that was originally proposed the 1.5, three factors, one being the lack of additional access, the 205 capacity is gradually, not gradually, pretty good at filling up. I-5 is very close to capacity. So that accessibility that we've seen over the past 20 years is rapidly diminishing. The second was just economic factors, that barring the economic development in Clark County which is, you know, a lot more involved than just painting colors on the map, barring that we would just naturally see a decrease in, in action here. And, third, was sending a clear message to METRO that we are not voluntarily going to accept a greater share of the region's growth than they themselves were willing to accept and deal with. So those were the justifications behind it.

Now -- and I'm not, you know, this was two years ago, a lot of facts have changed already. METRO's changed their forecast and I think that lays a decent argument for considering changing it up to that region, one, if that argument is still valid. There's --

LEIN: They've expanded their boundaries?

PRIDEMORE: Yeah, they have. But they didn't expand it for the population that they projected. That's common though. Their population projection is 1.58. I don't know, Patrick, do you know or, Rich, do you know? They've still got tens of thousands of population forecasts that they are not --

LEE: You know, in terms of a rate I think whereas overall in the region they're -- I mean for the four county estimate they have about 1.58 is the most recent figure, but within that 1.58 they're expecting Clark County, they're assuming Clark County will take over at 2 percent I believe. I don't know the exact figure, but it is disproportionate within the counties within their jurisdiction.

DELEISSEGUES: But to sustain the average annual increase the percent would go down.

PRIDEMORE: I'm sorry?

DELEISSEGUES: To sustain the average annual increase in numbers of people living in the county each year, the percentage of rate would go down. I mean the more people you have, the less percent of that you need to maintain the same number of people.

STANTON: So that would argue for a smaller number. I mean it would.

DELEISSEGUES: Yes, it would.

STANTON: It would. For me it was the fair share issue was one of them certainly. And I've long had a concern about improving the jobs to population balance and there are two ways you can do that. One is hold -- I mean hold one down and really pump up the other or pump both of them up one at the faster rate and we have very limited resources as you probably know. And I mean we just look at the WDOT numbers and realize we're not going to get a lot more of the State facilities, yet we have a growing number of people here means a growing number of people commuting to jobs in Oregon unless we're able to increase the number of jobs here which puts further demand on the I-5 Bridge. And that's got to be replaced, we know it, and we're talking in the billions to do that particular project with no hope that it's going to be funded in the near future anyway.

PRIDEMORE: I wouldn't be that cynical.

STANTON: Well, okay, let's put a toll on the bridge today, both bridges. And the other piece of it is cost to serve the residential component of the population. I mean I think it's

easy to attract population and easy to attract people, it's easy to get the commercial retail establishments to follow where the rooftops are, the piece that's hard to attract is that last piece which is the real job creation, the industrial component. And we've shown through some of the legislation that's been pushed recently that, you know, we're willing to give tax incentives and other kinds of incentives to get them here and we're getting more and more limited in dollars to do it, so I just think we need to put a real focus on jobs.

PRIDEMORE: I don't know that we're necessarily that far off. I mean if we look at the effective population, what's actually -- when you roll out these formulas, what actually rolls out even from the 1.5, you know, we're looking at an effective 1.9 percent is actually on there. You guys had recommended 2.1, it's certainly within a ballpark range here of disagreement.

STANTON: Especially if you consider the market factor usually, which is still in there at the 1.9; right?

PRIDEMORE: And I'm trying to, just trying to the --

STANTON: The 1.9 was with the infrastructure, but the market factor is still in place?

MORRIS: The market factor is full.

LEE: Yeah, the market factor has been used in sizing the boundary, but the capacity of the boundary, in assessing that you sort of irrespective of the market factor you'd fill up whatever land has been zoned. So you -- Betty Sue says you're sort of filling up that market factor which --

PRIDEMORE: And under that, which just ties in with what you were just saying, Dick, just looking at Alternative 2 or Alternative 5 you've got 170,000 more people over 20 years. That works out to what about, is that 8,000, 8500 additional people per year. If you look at the number of people coming to Clark County, that's actually I think higher than we averaged in the '90s. It's just that like you say the percentage rate changes. So I don't think this factors --

DELEISSEGUES: The smaller percent will result in more population.

PRIDEMORE: I don't know that we're talking --

LEIN: Too far off.

PRIDEMORE: -- too dramatic a difference between what you guys were talking about. And this is -- our decision was in the wake of your discussions about the growth projection things and certainly, and hopefully we just built on that. But with that said it's not a, you know, that's a legitimate decision that could still be altered by the Board deciding where

you sit and go forward.

MOSS: I can't remember what the basis for that, the recommendation, was that the Planning Commission came to and whether that was the average. I do remember there was quite a disparity of --

SMITH: It was a 5/2 vote.

MOSS: -- or divergence of opinion from the Planning Commission members on what that growth rate ought to be, but it's always seemed to me and that we're really divided into two camps or two philosophies here. And one is that we make our best estimate of what the actual growth is that's going to occur based upon the best information that we have available from historical data and what we think the economics are going to do in the future and then we plan for that. I think I'm in that camp. The other philosophy seems to be that we should use this comprehensive planning process to control the outcome, that is not that we can implement policies which affect the rate at which the population of Clark County is going to grow.

You know, those are two legitimate philosophies, but it seems to me like what we've been missing here in part of the -- in really reconciling those two is that I don't think we've talked sufficiently about what the costs are of doing both of those. Now certainly taking basically the market approach, and that is let the people come as they may and let growth occur, you know, basically unfettered but directed to where we want it to go, that philosophy is going to result in higher infrastructure costs which must be borne by the County and the other local agencies here, the cities, in some way and we've already talked at considerable length about the shortage of money for that purpose.

So it's a real problem that I won't, you know, I won't easily dismiss because somehow that demand that new people coming here creates has to be satisfied. And it's either going to be satisfied by building new infrastructure or it's going to be satisfied by lowering the level-of-service on the existing infrastructure. On the other hand, if we look at the philosophy which is we can control the growth by implementing certain measures such as keeping the urban growth boundary pulled in tighter, that comes at a cost too, and that's, there's some costs there that really concern me. One is a direct cost and that's that we have a lot of people employed in this County directly in the housing industry that are affected by a decision not to let growth occur. Even bigger than that, though, I'm concerned about the cost to my kids and your kids of just in terms of the affordability of housing here. And I don't think I've made it any secret before, I'm concerned now, have always been concerned, about the ability of my kids to live here in this county, and I've become particularly more concerned in this past year as I've seen the supply of buildable land for new residences shrinking.

I'm, you know, as you all know, I'm in the business and I'm looking at prices for land and at lot prices that a year ago I would have thought couldn't happen in that short of period of

time. Let me give you an example. A year ago when my developer clients were coming to me, and some of these folks are relative novices, and they were asking me, you know, what's a fair price to pay for residential land, you know, my kind of general answer at that time was \$90,000 is probably the upper end. Here we are a year later and we're seeing residential land go for 50 percent more than that and it's only because of the constrained land supply. You know, that has some effects that I'm really concerned about. And I can tell you it certainly isn't business related, you know, we're very busy. What I am concerned about, though, is are we willing to control the growth in this county by implementing measures which make the cost of living in this county extraordinarily higher than it otherwise would be.

You know, I think we have to recognize we've been a fast growing county. When I first came here back in the 1970 era I mean this was a very inexpensive place to live. It was one of my choices of all the places I visited in my work throughout the country because of the quality of life here and the fact that you could live here very inexpensively. You could buy land here, you could have the quality of life that you wanted and it just didn't cost a lot of money to do that. I've seen in the 30 or so years that I've been here that that's changed dramatically and I am very concerned about what the future is going to bring for my kids and for others. I really don't want to see us get to the position where I guess we're basically practicing what I view as the I got mine approach to life, and that's that we want to protect the quality of life for just those of us who occupy this territory right now. I would like to see some more discussion from you folks to see if there's, you know, if there's any way that we can have our cake and eat it too here.

And I can tell you frankly I understand the other side of this, that I think that all of the concerns that have been expressed about providing infrastructure here are, you know, clearly very important, and I absolutely believe that we're never going to have the kind of money that it takes to provide all of the infrastructure that's necessary to get a high level-of-service for a three percent growth rate. As a matter of fact I don't think we can get that for a one and a half percent growth rate. But anyway, having said all that, I'll give you a break.

PRIDEMORE: It's just like we said last week was that you keep quiet, you first work out your speech and then you deliver it and it's perfect. I think all the stuff I think you hit on exactly the issue that we struggle with. And I particularly think that that argument about the affordable housing which you used in other forums we talk about impact fees and those sorts of things is extremely important, and I think the no growth advocates in Clark County need to be a lot more aware that there are those backing costs the issue between those two extreme kinds of the unfettered completely versus the incredibly tightly controlled where exactly do we draw the line to balance all of those competing interests and that's, you know, certainly what we need to struggle with here in this plan.

MORRIS: Craig, I just want to note that the DEIS on Page 101 says that the average annual growth rate from 1990 to 2002 was 3.8.

DELEISSEGUES: Was what?

MORRIS: 3.8.

PRIDEMORE: I read 4.5 recently.

MORRIS: Well, this is our Bible, this is the DEIS, we take this for the truth, it's 3.8.

RUPLEY: No. I kind of want to weigh in maybe a little different, maybe not Lonnie, but I was thinking about if you look in here the two drivers of your local population growth, one is the economic and employment area and the other one is affordable housing. And I'm going to go back to the situation in Oregon in terms of we've had tremendous growth of people here and they've come for schools and when I'm looking at some of the impacts that are on schools, if we don't have the economic and employment issues but yet we have the affordable housing, we're going to invite people to come over to use our infrastructure but they're not going to be -- and they're going to be big users of those systems that we don't have money to pay for. And so there's a part of me that wants to not make housing so affordable as compared to the rest of the areas because and I'm not sure that I want to say close the fences or anything else, but as we look at what the impact has been and is going to continue to be, you're going to have huge impacts to schools and things like that, that that's part of the area that I deal with on a day-to-day basis.

So part of what I want to look at is how do we do the strategy that they talked about that basically no new across the river employment, but somehow we look at an economic strategy to keep people here which I know we had a lot of talk about. And second of all, maybe we slow down that affordability of housing so that it isn't so easy to get until we can get a balance.

BARCA: I'd like to follow up on that I guess.

RUPLEY: Oh, God, don't weigh in with me, Ron.

MORRIS: She was doing great.

DELEISSEGUES: Have at it.

BARCA: And not speaking from the school systems' point of view, but I think the State of Oregon really trumped anything that we were going to do by going ahead and defunding their school system, and regardless of housing prices in the area we would start looking more and more attractive in that regard. That being said, if you go from downtown Portland and you swing a 15-mile radius around and you look east, south and west, you are at build-out in those areas until you hit Clark County. We already have an inventory of buildable land that far surpasses anything in that radial movement around the rest of the

metro area. So when we talk about supply and demand and you're talking about the inflation of the land prices here, it's in relationship to the entire metro area, it's not just what's happening in Clark County. And we can't ignore the fact that we are part of this metro region when it comes to market prices. Obviously it's not a persuasive argument to say that people aren't willing to fight through the traffic on the bridge if they get a better deal on a house. If their schools are better for their kids, they're willing to go ahead and sacrifice the commute time and the pain of that traffic scenario.

I think what we have to really look at when we start to plan this out is some way of magnifying what Commissioner Stanton talked about in putting our plan, our limited resources into a jobs plan that says if we're going to be spending money, we want to have a focus. If we want to target specific areas around the aspect of affordable housing, I think we need to do regional or subregional planning in that regard, tying areas with transportation and the ability to have commercial development there to start saying this is the best way we can leverage the dollars we're going to be spending in infrastructure into the aspect of where there is some adequate infrastructure already in place and augmenting it would be the best value for the dollar. We can't afford to have one broad brush that sweeps across the county and says the plan's going to work everywhere the same way. I don't think we're at that point anymore. I think we already have seen through the exhaustive work that was done with the 17 little regions for financial planning some are in better shape than others, some will afford us better results for the dollars spent and I think we really have to get to that point with this plan of being forceful enough with it to plan out some of those places that we want to leverage the money and get some jobs in there. And if we can do that for the economic side I think we can do that for the residential side and try and get a balance where you're going to see a shift of the population into specific regions and then maybe that will help in the overall aspect of the demand for the property that's available in the inventory.

Another thing that I think is really important that we seem to be missing is now that we have good observed numbers I don't understand why we're talking about population growth in observed numbers or projected numbers that we want, but we continue to use assumptions that we've already found are faulty. Why don't we move towards the observed numbers that we have seen both for population density on a per house basis and the aspect of job creation in the commercial and in the industrial zone and the amount of infrastructure that we're genuinely consuming -- as opposed to what we projected we're consuming and start seeing what we genuinely need for boundary changes and growth to accommodate population, and then when we get to the aspect of which alternative we're really looking at and the dollars associated with it I think the dollars will shift some. I at least believe it will make the decision clearer and we won't be using assumptions that we've already proved false that we continue to use.

MOSS: Did I hear you say, Ron, just for clarification, that you want to use the observed numbers for population?

BARCA: The observed numbers for population per household.

MOSS: But not population growth?

DELEISSEGUES: You got the 2000 census, you could use that for growth.

BARCA: Yeah, but what I also said in that regard is I believe that we need to try and focus that and to leverage the limited resources we have towards the idea of moving towards a higher job to person growth rate. So if we go ahead and just accepted the residential and the higher number in that regard, then we are in fact not going to hit our job target because we will be sacrificing the dollars right up front for residential infrastructure.

PRIDEMORE: I think Lonnie's point is is you had said we should use those factual, factual assumptions, that whatever came into this effective population, one, would you advocate for just changing those numbers or would you also advocate for changing the population growth projection to what the effective rate is?

BARCA: I think the population growth number would change somewhat all on its own just by looking at the aspect of what the lands turn out to be in each of the alternatives. That would shift the numbers all by themselves because then the inventories would change also.

MORRIS: Lonnie's question was a lot simpler than that. If you want to use observed --

BARCA: He wants to use a 3.8 growth rate on an annual basis is what he's asking people.

MORRIS: He's asking of you if you are being consistent or not in using observed numbers and the answer I believe is that you do, you would use observed numbers in everything except the population growth rate and in there you would not use observed numbers.

BARCA: That's correct. I would target something. Probably 1.5 wouldn't be realistic when we get down to the aspect of seeing where we need to grow in relationship to subarea planning and what's available as far as infrastructure costs and the aspect of transportation nodes and commercial nodes. So I think that's my answer.

MOSS: Well, I, you know, I think we're nearly in agreement on most of these things. I think that this process needs to be intellectually honest. And that's poor worded, the implication there is anybody that doesn't agree with me isn't intellectually honest and that's not my intent. You know, I think that the rate of population growth in this county is going to be considerably in excess of one and a half percent no matter what policies that we implement, but I think that, that the policies that we implement can have a serious detrimental and serious positive effects maybe at the same time. You know, I think all of us can agree that what we want to do is we want to target some of these areas for job growth, and I think this idea of investing our money wisely to promote the most in job

growth is something that anybody at this table could not possibly disagree with. I think, you know, that's the one thing that we share.

Where it seems like we part is where we handle the other issue, and that's the residential and, you know, I don't think we're at the point where we just have to agree to disagree here, I just think that we need to consider along the way of what the impacts are going to be, and also whether the plan that we're creating here has any integrity if we know going in that the population growth rate that we're planning for is not going to be attained or is not going to be realistic.

PRIDEMORE: I think what you're saying, I mean it raises an extremely important point in that all of these assumptions we can see, you know, through this information on this page, Page 7, that, you know, the much valued 1.5 percent is not in fact what the plan under this is currently contemplating. I mean that you would have 1.9 percent just because of the difference based on what we know occurs out there versus what the plan currently assumes occurs out there and should those assumptions that, you know, the assumptions versus the observed out there be shifted, I think you'd clearly have to make a change in the population forecast. There's just too -- it would look like the same plan.

MORRIS: I guess I have a question. Pat, in this calculations of the actual capacity you filled up the market factor. Is that what caused most of the actual capacity was the market factor? Because the difference in the infrastructure of 11 percent doesn't seem like that would be (inaudible) thousands of people.

LEE: Part of it is the factoring up to the DEA from the uncovered employment figure which runs the transportation models, but some of it is certainly we're filling out the market factor, that we're sizing the urban area and zoning it for urban uses and the sizes that are contemplated in the alternatives on an effective basis are going to give you more than those controlled totals because of what at least we believe is the disparity in assumptions.

MORRIS: I understand that, but we're essentially talking about two big changes. One of them is you fill up the 25 percent allowance for the market factor and the other one is that you change the infrastructure deduction from 38 to 27. And the reason I'm asking that is because if we continue to say when you get to 70 percent you're going to move the boundaries, then we still are effectively at a 1.5 because you don't ever fill up your market factor, you always keep your market factor when you get to 70 percent of your capacity then move.

LEE: Well, I mean -- and by State law every ten years we have to roll out the boundary for the next 20 years, so really we already have a built-in market factor if you look at it over a 20-year period.

PRIDEMORE: As compared to the 70 percent to ever kick in you would have to virtually grow at almost double whatever the percentage plan you would have on a region. I mean

that's probably not true, it's probably 70, 80 percent or more than what --

MORRIS: Right. But he's talking a static situation here. If nothing else changes, this is what the capacity would be within the urban growth area.

LEE: Yes. At least GMA says we're supposed to monitor and every ten years we directly have to address the sizing issue. And we didn't start off this process doing that and we ended up doing that and so you have kind of this ten-year buffer that is built into the requirements of the GMA already.

DELEISSEGUES: So the best of all worlds would be Alternative 2 with the cities' perspective and what they want to do that they can do themselves to make themselves economically viable and they can. The best thing for Clark County would be to have all the cities in Clark County be a viable economic area. I mean to invest the money in the best place that's already got the infrastructure and so forth, make the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. So, you know, you can't just I think do only that. So if you took the Commissioners' approach with the cities' perspective and add some of the Discovery Corridor strategy --

LEIN: You want to make a motion, Dick?

DELEISSEGUES: So we're out of here.

MORRIS: You could be a man after my own heart.

PRIDEMORE: This is just starting to get good so I really feel like it's time to take a break and break the, you know, the flow of progression, mostly because we need to worry about our court reporter. What's the will of the group?

DELEISSEGUES: Sure.

PRIDEMORE: You want to take a break and then continue the discussion. And we'll still shoot to get out of here by 9:00 unless we're so fascinated that we just can't tear each other away from each other.

MOSS: Does that mean I have to quit talking?

PRIDEMORE: If that's all it took, Lonnie. Let's take a break.

(Pause in proceedings.)

PRIDEMORE: Okay. Anything good come out of the break that anybody wanted to discuss or build on the earlier discussion?

SMITH: Well, Lonnie made some good points on affordability, but affordability isn't just the function of house price, it's also a function of good family wage jobs in the area. So I think there can be a balance there. We can't just think the price side, we have to think the jobs again comes to the forefront. And another thing, I think our timing is really poor. If we were to open things up, with the school situation in Oregon we're going to have a tremendous influx of people from Oregon. And unfortunately those are people who already have jobs in Oregon, they're not people coming from Montana or California looking for jobs in Clark County, those are going to be people who already work in Oregon who want their kids to play football or volleyball and we're just becoming more and more of a bedroom community it seems like.

MORRIS: I'd like to suggest something that isn't jobs or housing. I guess in terms of the assumption, Jada, you spoke briefly or touched on I think a position that the Chamber's been talking about. I'm not sure what you said that made me think about it, but all the way through this we have tied jobs to population, only the population forecast to come here instead of jobs to the population that is already here as well and I think that may have been -- that may be one of the assumptions and one of the links that we made that might need a different approach to it.

RUPLEY: I think that's a really good way to look at it because I think it's the net, we want to keep more of them here than to head out again. And while I don't want to use a political example, I think one of the things as you look at Legacy I know that's going to keep more people in our county because there are people that are going across for those jobs. And so those are the kinds of things that to me makes sense.

MORRIS: It's that recapture thing. It's not just keeping it status quo but actually diminishing the number, the hard number of people who go across.

PRIDEMORE: There was some discussion on that score last week about the possibility that we were adding too much industrial land which is the first time that possibility had ever been suggested that I've heard. Any thoughts on that after last week? I mean I know it was Jeff's point.

MORRIS: Who said that? Oh, Jeff. Oh, that's right it was Jeff.

PRIDEMORE: Anybody thought about that? Is it possible to add too much?

STANTON: I mean it was a really valid comment, don't you think? I mean I hadn't thought about it that way where others have made private investments to make their land prime and now we're talking about providing public investment for essentially competition for them and I hadn't really thought about it that way before.

PRIDEMORE: I don't think Jeff had either.

STANTON: It was just a valid observation.

MORRIS: But just opening up land doesn't require you to put a public investment in or making it available, so I don't know whether you can -- yes, you have to be somewhat reasonable, but I guess my point is I don't think, I think that's an assumption that probably doesn't work real well when we tie it only to the new population.

PRIDEMORE: One of the remand issues in the '94 plan was that the County had added too much industrial land and so clearly there needs to be a strong rationale for why you are pursuing that kind of a strategy. But --

MORRIS: Recapture, that's a real good strategy.

STANTON: Yeah. That was Betty Sue's comment about recapturing some of the jobs, yeah.

BARCA: And I think we do need to make a distinction between the aspect of just adding industrial land to the inventory as opposed to adding prime industrial land or making that actual public investment towards creating prime industrial land. We did discuss a little bit last week about the potential of the industrial land bank or holding for industrial lands, urban holding, with that designation and I think the aspect of when we start talking about for planning purposes without the investment being put in place initially, it gives us a place on the map where we can start showing the potential where then if we decide that the investment is warranted for the aspect of a potential client that would come in and require such a parcel and the public is willing to go ahead and do that investment of public funds for creation of the prime land, then we have it. I think it still comes back to the aspect for us of if it's not designated, if it's not identified, then it is something else.

And land gets consumed up in little bits at a time and you don't watch it disappear from the potential use until you recognize as Commissioner Pridemore asked for specifically, well, how many 75 acre or larger parcels are genuinely available in a particular region. So if that is part of the criteria from Columbia River Economic Development Council as saying it's valid and we're seeing that that's valid, I think we need to make an effort early in the process, much like we would do in the aspect of critical habitat or something of that nature is you identify it and you make an effort to protect it even if the protection is in the aspect of land bank or holding or something of that nature. You're not going to be able to recapture the jobs if you can't recapture the land. And if it's fragmented or has other uses on it, then the price per job, which was in our document earlier, some of those assumptions are going to change and the price per job will go up.

PRIDEMORE: Kind of to build on that, one of the things we hear from CREDC is the issue of, and I guess that issue of recapture rate versus and how much land do we need, but for the kinds of economic development things that we're talking about doing, one of the pieces

that we need to have available for a prospective employer locating here is choice, and if we only have one parcel available and they come and they look at that one parcel and it just doesn't fit their desires and that's all we have, we lose that person as opposed to having a few different places where we can say, you know, we've got these various options, we increase the likelihood that we'll be able to attract those employers.

LEIN: How do you bring in the employers that are going to pay the family wage?

PRIDEMORE: We've, and you guys have had this discussion too, is I have somebody living in my house right now who would be happy to have any job, not just a family wage. I think it's important if we go through and we're expending public investment money and making those kinds of efforts, we should target the higher end jobs but that doesn't mean we should not recognize lower paying jobs as jobs. It's just a question of how much effort, where do we put our effort. Maybe the public's strongest effort should be for those higher end family wage jobs but --

MORRIS: I think it's important to be realistic when we talk about making public investment. So far, at this point in time, we're talking about \$10 million worth of public investment and that's not a lot of public investment. So when we phrase the discussion as though somehow or other we were going to go out -- we could often sound when we say that as though we're going to go out and make everything ready in the Discovery Corridor, that's not it. I mean there's a very little bitty pot of money to work with here for investment in infrastructure. There's just not much. But actually we do, I think that a part of this strategy, help me remember, Judie, I can't, but there is a discussion about knowing the kind of industry that's coming and you know what SIC codes they pay and you know what the range is that they pay in and so as you target and you try to market to, you market to particular types of job producing employers who pay that wage.

STANTON: And that's what the EDC does is the recruitment piece of it. And the reason that we went to them to ask looking at the attributes of Clark County, looking at the tax structure, looking at future kinds of industries and the jobs that we might expect to recruit here what should we try to target, and that's when they came back with kind of a focus on knowledge base, health care, they had a whole list of the kinds of things that we ought to try to target, keeping in mind that we have a University what some of the programs are that they offer, what kind of (inaudible) we already found here and, you know, those kinds of things went into their recommendation.

LEIN: What kind of wage does Dollar pay? Any idea?

STANTON: How many jobs do they have?

PRIDEMORE: How many jobs per acre.

LEIN: Yeah. You know, that's an example. That had to be some sort of recruitment and I

don't think that's a living family wage.

RUPLEY: You know who we've also got to remember that we have people in this county of all levels and abilities and not everybody is going to be able to go in for the, and I'm sitting here looking at \$41,000, beginning teachers don't even make, you know, that kind of thing and so beginning teaching is not a family wage job. So I think we have to also take into account what we've got.

PRIDEMORE: We talked yesterday, and I didn't get a chance to add on this, about the \$10 million for that economic development REET. If it's handled carefully and we only spend it at a proper time and not just on too great a speculation and we get a rollover, that 10 million could come back and be used again in another form so it hopefully comes back. So hopefully and granted, it's a very idealistic hope but hopefully it does amount to more than 10 million over --

MORRIS: Hopefully it does, but I just think we shouldn't -- when we talk about targeting our investments, we ought to be realistic about what kind of resources we've got here that we're targeting.

STANTON: Well, I think the other piece that we do have is the road fund. I mean we made a decision to build the Padden Expressway --

MORRIS: Right.

STANTON: -- because we had all the issues around the Pipeline residential developments in the east end of the county, insufficient infrastructure to move those people, and that is an investment to support --

MORRIS: Right.

STANTON: -- residential construction. A big chunk of our road fund went to build that. So if we were doing, making that decision today, in my mind I would be thinking, no, I want to do something to support new jobs --

MORRIS: Right, you'd put it into Clark County.

STANTON: -- or somewhere else, yeah.

PRIDEMORE: And that was what the focus public investment was all about was what are those kinds of --

SMITH: Oregon's woes gives us a great opportunity right now. We have a window where we should be able to attract the kind of companies that will give us those kind of jobs. Maybe some of that 10 million could be spent on PR, let them know, you know, here we

are, we're ready, we're sending our kids to school, you know, nine months a year type thing.

STANTON: Assuming you have an employee base here.

PRIDEMORE: One of the regional things that we try to avoid is people picking, you know, people within the region picking off each other, that we really need to get those folks from outside. So at the present time at least we wouldn't go and pick their employees, but if they have somebody who comes in from out of the area and is looking at their place and it doesn't quite work for them they would say, well, have you gone and checked out Clark County because they have all these things to offer and that kind of regional cooperation might get us more mileage.

RUPLEY: Tough.

PRIDEMORE: It's just a thought, just a thought.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, if you want to get diabolical, you know, we'd let the people work over there and have a revenue sharing, they collect the income tax from the workers and we collect the property tax from the escalating houses, we'd all be better off.

PRIDEMORE: Half of that I agree with.

STANTON: I thought you were going to share the income tax.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, it's called revenue sharing.

STANTON: Yeah, they'd share with us.

DELEISSEGUES: Sure, they would. They won't even help us build a bridge.

PRIDEMORE: Other thoughts?

RUPLEY: Yeah, we always disintegrate after a break. You should never let us take a break.

PRIDEMORE: Thoughts on the process? Are we heading in the right direction? Wrong direction? Dangerous direction?

RUPLEY: So you're going to develop Alternative 6?

PRIDEMORE: That's the Deleissegues plan.

RUPLEY: Yeah, the Deleissegues alternative.

MORRIS: I like your plan, Dick, I thought it was good.

BARCA: So is there --

DELEISSEGUES: It leaves your options open, Craig.

BARCA: Is there any thought about entertaining the model using the observed numbers and coming back and seeing what we need in the way of growth both in land and in dollar value based on the observed numbers or are we going to see that or --

PRIDEMORE: Well, I think, speaking for me, I'm trying to be careful about saying anything about a decision. We haven't been to public hearing yet. I want to be able to have people come in and testify on that and then I think it's a discussion that certainly would need to happen at the Board.

STANTON: I think it would be interesting to see and doesn't that play into the model that you had prepared, Betty Sue?

MORRIS: Yeah. And they had that, they have some of that, they have that one little thing here in terms of the growth rate over the years but it does.

BARCA: What's that?

MORRIS: Because they ought to be able to whip that right out.

BARCA: Because I guess I'm still back to the public investment infrastructure cost report that basically says we can't afford any of the choices and so, you know, which one are we picking. It's just a matter of how much indebtedness are we going to be picking up. They're not using the observed numbers because that wasn't the way that the alternatives were formatted and that wasn't the assumptions that were made.

MORRIS: But they are because they've used -- when they did the capital facilities plan they used build-out numbers so they have done that already. In the capital facilities plan they used the build-out numbers.

PRIDEMORE: That was the point of this comparison --

MORRIS: It's already done.

PRIDEMORE: -- was that that's what the capital facilities plan would be designed at.

MORRIS: Because there's a difference between the way that the Commissioners' alternatives played out on the ground, but then when you designed your capital facilities

plan, you had to design your capital facilities plan with full build-out. So they have done that in that way.

BARCA: Did we design full build-out with the infrastructure at 38 percent or at 27 percent?

MORRIS: I don't know. I think you did it at 27, didn't you? I don't know.

LEE: Yeah, I would think. Well, and if we approach it that way we looked at, you know, if it's --

MORRIS: Infrastructure is infrastructure.

LEE: -- if it's zoned you are able to get a certain capacity based on that zoning and we didn't want to do an analysis that would undersize what that would be.

PRIDEMORE: And then to clarify, at this point those estimates are at this 20, 30,000 foot level, we haven't done the full capital facilities plan saying exactly what's needed. And the huge deficit was based on the State facilities that presumed no new revenue, no new money coming out of the State for the next 20 years. It's not as dire as it might appear at first glance and that's something we'll have to look at over the next few months as the actual capital facilities plan is developed.

LEE: Yeah, clearly we want as clear a direction on which preferred alternative. To say that we've designed it at this point is a bit early before we analyze what the impacts are based on a build-out scenario and try to get some cost estimates based on that. But in terms of once you have the direction, then we actually have to take a harder look at as far as the size of each facilities in terms of size of the facilities that we're looking at, probably do some additional cost estimates to reflect that. So there's still quite a lot to do on that capital facilities piece.

DELEISSEGUES: I think that's one of the problems of just looking at these alternatives separately is they look like there's some costs when you try to fund them, but if you pick out the parts that offer an investment opportunity when the money returns, like you were pointing out that's the challenge and that's what you really want to do.

PRIDEMORE: There's also within the plans that we're looking at right now those alternatives there hasn't been specific land use analysis to determine exactly what should the zoning be. We've got, you know, broad based urban low density housing in this area, well, that --

DELEISSEGUES: That is a side cost.

PRIDEMORE: -- that's still at that really high level that we do need to do lower level analysis to make those decisions but, and none of that has occurred at this point in the

process.

DELEISSEGUES: And that's what I'd be listening for in the public hearing is where those investment opportunities are in return and capital investment you put in a dollar and get two back, that might be, you know, all for it.

BARCA: I think there's just a lot left. You're going to talk about starting to tear off pieces of one alternative and tear off pieces of another one, but some of these assumptions, what was it, 20,000 or 30,000 foot level, by being that general with it we need to get down to more detail to what those fragments really are going to be saying or going to be playing out. That was my statement earlier about taking particular regions and talking in detail about some planning around those areas so the financial plan is in place, and then with that you overlay what commercial aspect you think is going to be there in place and the right mix of residential component that blends in with it and then surrounds it.

One of the things that we've heard over the last couple of years is these large blocks of mono dimensional residential development where the zoning is so large and it goes on for miles and miles it's actually a detriment towards the aspect of being able to leverage our infrastructure costs. If we have single-family development in traditional tract style housing and it's hundreds and hundreds of homes, then the traffic pattern that results from that is dramatically different than if we were able to break that up and have some high density in close to a commercial development that's adjacent to it and we can start changing the patterns.

I think we got some testimony about the aspect of within the school districts where if we have a lot of high density all compacted together, when the demographics change, the kids get older, the financial outlook of the families change, they start moving away, we're creating mobility factors that impact the schools as well and it's tough for the schools to have a scenario where they can stay in the region. Families can upgrade their residential component, they can work in an adjacent area and the kids can have some stability and the school can have some stability through a certain amount of grades growing up in the area regardless of what their housing condition is, whether they're going up or in some cases whether they're coming down. I think we have to get smaller in detail when we're starting to look at these zones for financial impact. So the leveraging aspect of getting the dollars back is good and I think once we do that, then we need to spend some detailed time and talk about the transportation component for both the commercial and the residential that would surround that.

PRIDEMORE: And that wasn't something that we could actually do here.

DELEISSEGUES: They're all in here. You know, they've done a tremendously good job I thought on this focus public investment plan, a lot of good information in there. Once you, you know, that could help make the decision as well as look at what the implication of the decision is going to be.

PRIDEMORE: I think right now what we've got is the information that we have is essentially comparative in nature, it's not very hard and fast, and into this next phase over the next several months is to really refine based on the preferred alternative that reflects where we want to go.

DELEISSEGUES: They sure got a lot of good information. It was well done.

PRIDEMORE: Any other thoughts?

MOSS: I was about to say something and Jada politely suggested that I not.

PRIDEMORE: Now we know how this Planning Commission runs.

BARCA: It happens to me all the time, Lonnie.

DELEISSEGUES: It's never stopped you before.

MOSS: Actually Jada didn't say anything of the sort, she just looked at me in that way that reminded me of my mom when she used to say shut up.

PRIDEMORE: Please, any thoughts?

MOSS: Yes, some thoughts. One of the things that I'm somewhat curious about and I think that would help me in my analysis in some of these alternatives, or at least one of them, is that I've had very little firsthand experience with this but I understand that you folks have had some feedback at least from some of the cities that indicate they don't like some aspects of the Discovery Corridor plan and --

PRIDEMORE: Did you hear that this week? Did you read anything about it?

MOSS: Would you care to share anything that we've heard about that or --

STANTON: I think the concern is that they want to be able to diversify the land uses within their own cities and so that they have an employment base and an opportunity to spread the tax base to the services that they have in their cities. In particular it affects schools and the City of Battle Ground is interested in taking population as well as long as they get the jobs to go with it. And frankly one of my biggest concerns about Discovery Corridor is that virtually all of it is in the Ridgefield School District, just one school district, and so if we're real successful and we get a lot of jobs there, people will be locating their families in other school districts without the tax base, and I think cities are looking at it from a tax base kind of a position.

PRIDEMORE: I hear more about that from private sector people who feel that we're getting all of this tremendous pressure from the Cities about it a lot more than I feel pressure from the Cities about it I mean. And I think it's certainly an issue with them, but I haven't --

STANTON: It's an issue.

MORRIS: Oh, we just got a letter that said we don't like it and if you try it, we'll sue you.

PRIDEMORE: Oh, did we? Oh, that letter.

MORRIS: Yeah, that one.

PRIDEMORE: I guess I'm thinking of the in the one-on-one conversations it's not, you know, it's a compromisable situation, it's not a hard and fast you can't do anything in the Discovery Corridor.

MORRIS: Right.

STANTON: Well, they only want to see the -- the Growth Management Act does call for development within urban growth boundaries, see, so that's one of their concerns as well.

MOSS: But it allows development outside too.

MORRIS: Well, the Discovery Corridor would be a matter of moving urban growth boundaries so it would go in.

MOSS: Right. That's true.

MORRIS: But they have a legitimate concern in worrying about their ability to provide services for their residents. And it's a legitimate concern for us to take into account and at the same time it's going to happen, there is going to be a time when that corridor is going to develop and so we cannot ignore the land uses along the corridor all the way to Woodland. So it doesn't mean that you necessarily have to run out there and do the Discovery Corridor today or tomorrow, but you do have to understand that if we don't do something about that land, maybe part of it it goes into job producing land and the rest of it has some other kind of a designation, but otherwise at a point in time it's going to go that way.

STANTON: And I think the concern at least I remember hearing from Ridgefield at the last steering committee that they didn't see the Discovery Corridor as being something that would happen tomorrow but maybe over the next 50 years, and the concern was to try to keep the land itself intact in big enough chunks that it could be developed for an employment base.

PRIDEMORE: The original way it was discussed it sounded like they wanted to have a, you know, a one-mile wide swath all the way up the I-5 and start developing that right now and obviously that's not, that's not even what they intended.

MOSS: No, that's not going to happen.

PRIDEMORE: But a lot of folks got that impression initially (inaudible).

MORRIS: But they put it on the table.

PRIDEMORE: Vancouver and Camas reached an agreement on the no man's land. Any thoughts on that?

MOSS: Pardon me?

PRIDEMORE: Have you guys seen that?

MOSS: No.

LEE: My sources inform me that actually a signed letter was submitted today. Source.

PRIDEMORE: There are some things that --

HUDSON: The second signature will be this weekend. You'll get it Monday. Yes, we did.

LEE: But I've heard it from my source in the City of Camas as well.

PRIDEMORE: It is a complete division between the three areas that were in question between Camas and Vancouver, they would be not leaving, you know, no buffer or anything in between, which is the part that would be lost should the Board adopt that agreement. And maybe that's as much as we can really talk about right now without having maps in front of us to show exactly what they've agreed to. It's just bouncing it off. Are there any thoughts on that?

MORRIS: Well, there was a fairly legitimate map in the newspaper.

PRIDEMORE: There was, it's just we don't have it. Well, I can try to stretch this out until 9:00.

MOSS: No, that's not necessary.

RUPLEY: That ruins our hourly rate.

PRIDEMORE: Well, I appreciate it. This is extremely good discussion. I think we hit on a lot of important issues. And without objection we stand adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m. All proceedings of tonight's meeting are filed in Clark County Community Development/Long Range Planning.

Craig Pridemore, Chair
Board of County Commissioners

Vaughn Lein, Chair
Clark County Planning Commission

SWPC-BOCC Minutes of 06-19-03